



## *Policing Connecticut's Hallways: The Prevalence and Impact of School Resource Officers in Connecticut*

### *Appendix A*

In this appendix, we describe in greater detail the statistical analyses and results used in our report.

#### *Data Sources*

The data used in this report come from three sources: the 2015-2016 and 2013-2014 United States Department of Education Office of Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC), the 2015-2016 school year reporting from the Connecticut State Department of Education data reporting tool “EdSight,”<sup>1</sup> and District Reference Groups (DRG) designations that group school districts according to similar community characteristics and resources. We used the 2015 SDE DRG designations.<sup>2</sup> Our data set included data from charter schools where possible, but we should note that charter schools are their own district so any analyses where we look at District Reference Groups do not include charter schools. The CRDC is a federally mandated reporting of school-level data regarding educational access for protected classes of students (gender, race/ethnicity, nationality, disability status, etc.). All public schools (PreK-12) in the country are required to report to the federal government on issues such as the use of exclusionary discipline, teacher experience, and enrollment in advanced courses. EdSight is a state repository of school-, state-, and district-level education data taken from all school districts in Connecticut. The authors of this paper acknowledge that the data in this study are now two years out of date. Because there is no central public reporting of the presence of SROs in CT, data on which schools employ SROs are most available and accessible through the CRDC website, but the last available year of data available through this data set is School Year (SY) 2015-2016.

#### *Data Suppression Methodology*

Wherever possible, this paper attempts to disaggregate the data by race/ethnicity. When populations of students are small enough that individual students might be identifiable, state and federal student data privacy regulations prevent access to data on these students. This is done through a process called data “suppression.” Suppressed data are represented in a data set by displaying an asterisk (\*) instead of a numerical value. SDE regulations dictate that when a number of students in a category is between one and five, SDE suppresses that data.<sup>3</sup> We used a formula in Excel to impute a random digit between 1 and 5 so that we could include schools with suppressed data within our analyses.

When data from the CRDC indicated more precise counts of students from mutually exclusive categories (such as saying two Black students with disabilities were expelled and one Black student without disabilities was expelled, therefore there must be at least three Black students present at a school) falling within the data suppression range, we adjusted the random data generator to generate a number between the one reported through the CRDC data (in our example, three) and five.

We chose to use a random number generator for suppressed data because a large number of schools had unreported/missing data, and treating suppressed data as missing could have covered up important differences caused by smaller numbers of students. This methodology also allowed us to differentiate between schools with small numbers of students experiencing a particular outcome and schools with zero students experiencing a particular outcome.

If a demographic or exclusionary discipline variable had more than 30 percent of cases marked as missing or suppressed, we chose not to run analyses using that variable. The Smarter Balance test scores we analyzed were missing 36 percent of cases and suppressed 9.5 to 15 percent of cases, so results should be interpreted with extreme caution.

*Table 1. Descriptive statistics on race/ethnicity data suppression within this data set. Note that 14 schools did not report any race/ethnicity data.*

Student race/ethnicity	N schools with race/ethnicity data suppressed	N schools with reported race/ethnicity data	Percent of schools with missing or suppressed data
Asian	373	953	29
Black or African American	380	946	29
Hispanic or Latino	165	1161	13
White	189	1137	15
Total student population	71	1255	6

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

To analyze exclusionary discipline and Smarter Balanced test scores in a manner that allowed for direct comparisons, we calculated the percentage of students belonging to a particular racial/ethnic group who experienced discipline in the 2015-2016 school year and the percentage of students scoring at or above “proficient” on Smarter Balanced ELA and Math tests. We marked unreported data as missing in all variables. If a school had zero students of a particular race/ethnicity attending the school, calculating the percentage of students belonging to that racial/ethnic group created a “divide by zero” error. To manage this error, in the variables calculating percent of students in a racial/ethnic group experiencing a particular outcome, we marked schools that reported having zero students belonging to a racial/ethnic group as missing data. We chose this method so as not to conflate schools that *could not* discipline students belonging to a particular racial/ethnic group with schools that genuinely have a population of students belong to a particular racial/ethnic group and *did not* expel, refer to law enforcement, or arrest any children within that group.

Analyzing the relationships between two variables, like the presence of school resource officers and student arrests, requires that we go beyond basic data analysis to understand the extent to which the variables are actually related or if differences can be attributed to other factors we did not include. For this reason, we used SPSS, a statistical analysis software to run analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-test analyses. We used the MedCalc online relative risk calculator to run our risk ratio analyses.<sup>4</sup> In describing results from these analyses, we refer to some of the findings as “statistically significant.” When something is identified as statistically significant, it means that there is a high degree of certainty that the differences seen can be attributed to one of our identified variables, as opposed to something unforeseen or random variation.

## *Results*

### ***Question 1: Are there differences in the presence of SROs across District Reference Groups?***

After performing the ANOVA analysis, we found that there was a significant difference in the presence of SROs by DRG,  $F(8,1064)=9.30, p<.001$ . Levene’s Test of Equality of Error indicated that the variance of SROs within schools differed across DRGs, so we used an adjusted  $p$ -value of .01 to evaluate our effect, and we determined that even with an adjusted  $p$ -value the difference is statistically significant. SROs were most present within schools in DRGs B and H and least present within schools in DRGs E and F.

Fewer schools across all DRGs had SROs ( $N=262$ , or 24 percent of schools) than did not have a SRO ( $N=811$ ).

### ***Question 2: Across District Reference Groups, are there differences between the characteristics of schools that have SROs versus schools that do not have SROs?***

The analyses presented to answer our second question (across DRGs, are there differences between the characteristics of schools that have SROs versus schools that do not have SROs) only include schools belonging to one of the nine DRGs. Charter networks are not included in the following analyses.

#### *Grades Present*

Across Connecticut schools belonging to one of the nine DRGs, more schools do not have a SRO than do have a SRO. We performed a one-sample t-test with a test value of .5 to examine the overall presence of SROs across schools. The test value of .5 allowed us to test they hypothesis that half of these schools would have an SRO and half of these schools would not have an SRO. Schools were significantly more likely not to have a SRO ( $N=811$ ) than to have a SRO ( $N=262$ );  $t(1072)= -19.50, p<.001$ .

Table 2. Schools with cohorts of very young children are significantly more likely not to have SROs than schools without very young children, and schools with cohorts of teens are significantly more likely to have SROs than schools without teens.

	Schools with Grade Present		Schools without Grade Present		X <sup>2</sup>	p-value
	SRO present	No SRO present	SRO present	No SRO present		
Preschool	55	257	202	505	13.75	<.001*
Kindergarten	98	426	160	338	24.39	<.001*
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	70	199	188	565	0.12	.732
9 <sup>th</sup> Grade	88	114	170	650	44.77	<.001*
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	89	135	169	629	31.91	<.001*

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

*Preschool.* The relationship between the presence of a preschool in a school and the presence of a SRO in a school was significant,  $X^2(1, N = 1019) = 13.75, p < .001$ . More schools with preschools did not have an SRO ( $N=257, 82$  percent) than did have an SRO ( $N=55, 18$  percent), and this pattern was also true of schools without preschools. More schools without preschools also did not have an SRO ( $N=505, 71$  percent) than did have an SRO ( $N=202, 29$  percent). However, the difference was significantly smaller than among schools with preschools.

*Kindergarten.* The relationship between the presence of kindergarten students in a school and the presence of a SRO in a school was significant,  $X^2(1, N = 1022) = 24.39, p < .001$ . More schools with kindergarten cohorts did not have an SRO ( $N=426, 81$  percent) present than did have an SRO ( $N=98, 19$  percent), and this pattern was also true of schools without kindergarten cohorts. More schools without kindergarten cohorts also did not have an SRO ( $N=338, 68$  percent) than did have an SRO ( $N=160, 32$  percent), but the difference was significantly smaller than among schools with kindergarten cohorts.

*8<sup>th</sup> grade.* We found no significant relationship between the presence of an 8<sup>th</sup> grade in a school and the presence of a SRO in a school,  $X^2(1, N = 1022) = .12, p = .732$ . More schools with 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts did not have an SRO present ( $N=199, 74$  percent) than did have an SRO present ( $N=70, 26$  percent), and this pattern is also true of schools without 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts. More schools without 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts did not have an SRO present ( $N=565, 75$  percent) than did have an SRO present ( $N=188, 25$  percent), and the difference was similar to that of schools with 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts.

*9<sup>th</sup> grade.* The relationship between the presence of 9<sup>th</sup> grade students in a school and the presence of a SRO in a school was significant,  $X^2(1, N = 1022) = 44.77, p < .001$ . Within schools that had 9<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts, more schools did not have a SRO ( $N=114, 56$  percent) than did have a SRO ( $N=88, 44$  percent). Within schools that did not have 9<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts, far more schools did not have a SRO ( $N=650, 79$  percent) than did have a SRO ( $N=170, 21$  percent), and the difference was significantly larger than among schools with 9<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts.

*12<sup>th</sup> grade.* The relationship between the presence of 12<sup>th</sup> grade students in a school and the presence of a SRO in a school was significant,  $X^2(1, N = 1022) = 31.91, p < .001$ . Within schools that had

12<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts, more schools did not have a SRO ( $N=135$ , 60 percent) than did have a SRO ( $N=89$ , 40 percent). Within schools that did not have 12<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts, far more schools did not have a SRO ( $N=629$ , 79 percent) than did have a SRO ( $N=169$ , 21 percent), and the difference was significantly larger than among schools with 12<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts.

### *School Characteristics*

We performed a series of one-way ANOVAs to determine the relationship between the presence of SROs in schools and the percentage of students of various racial and ethnic backgrounds. We found no significant relationship between the percentage of Black, White, Asian and Latino students in schools with and without SROs. For all groups of students there is a one percent or less difference in their proportions in schools with and without SROs.

*Table 3. School racial/ethnic makeup did not significantly differ between schools with SROs and schools without SROs.*

Percent of students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		DF	F	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD			
Asian	5.24	5.22	4.48	6.16	1, 1064	3.24	.072
Black or African American	12.04	16.09	11.28	15.20	1, 1064	.48	.491
Hispanic or Latino	21.14	19.43	21.56	20.68	1, 1064	.08	.774
White	57.72	28.86	56.51	30.18	1, 1064	.33	.569

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

*Asian.* There was not a significant difference in the percentage of Asian students attending schools with SROs and without SROs,  $F(1, 1064)=3.24, p=.072$ . The percent of Asian students in schools with an SRO ( $M=5.24, SD=5.22$ ) was slightly—but not significantly—larger than the percent of Asian students in schools without an SRO ( $M=4.48, SD=6.16$ ).

*Black or African American.* There was not a significant difference in the percentage of Black or African American students attending schools with SROs and without SROs,  $F(1, 1064)=.48, p=.491$ . The percent of Black or African American students in schools with an SRO ( $M=12.04, SD=16.09$ ) was similar to the percent of Black or African American students in schools without an SRO ( $M=11.28, SD=15.20$ ).

*Hispanic or Latino.* There was not a significant difference in the percentage of Hispanic or Latino students attending schools with SROs and without SROs,  $F(1, 1064)=.08, p=.774$ . The percent of Hispanic or Latino students in schools with an SRO ( $M=21.14, SD=19.43$ ) was similar to percent of Hispanic or Latino students in schools without an SRO ( $M=21.56, SD=20.68$ ).

*White.* There was not a significant difference in the percentage of White students attending schools with SROs and without SROs,  $F(1, 1064)=.33, p=.569$ . The percent of white students in schools with an SRO ( $M=57.72, SD=28.86$ ) was similar to the percent of white students in schools without an SRO ( $M=56.51, SD=30.18$ ).

The effect of school size on the presence of SROs in schools was significant. We performed a one-way ANOVA to determine the relationship between the presence of SROs in schools and the size of the schools. Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances indicated that the variance in school size differed between schools with an SRO and schools without an SRO, so we used an adjusted  $p$ -value of .01 to evaluate our statistic. With the adjusted  $p$ -value, the effect of school size on the presence of SROs in schools was significant,  $F(1, 1064)=172.74, p<.001$ . The average number of students in schools with an SRO ( $M=681.34, SD=456.66$ ) was significantly larger than the average number of students in schools without an SRO ( $M=373.38, SD=274.12$ ).

***Question 3: When comparing schools with and without SROs, what is the impact of the presence of SROs on school climate, exclusionary discipline and achievement?***

*Exclusionary Discipline*

Relative risk analyses show that for Black, White, and Latino children, the presence of a SRO has a significant impact on their risk of being expelled. For these three groups, the presence of a SRO increases the chance that they will be expelled when compared to students of the same race in schools without SROs. Latino students, for example are over two times more likely to be expelled from school where a SRO is present than a Latino child who attends a school where a SRO is not present.

*Table 4. Black, Hispanic, and White children attending schools with an SRO have a higher risk of expulsion than Black, Hispanic, and White children attending schools without an SRO.*

Student race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		Relative Risk	95% CI	Z	p-value
	N expelled	N not expelled	N expelled	N not expelled				
Asian	8	10,001	12	14,685	.98	.40-2.39	.05	.962
Black or African American	168	20,517	187	41,003	1.79	1.45-2.20	5.49	<.001*
Hispanic or Latino	204	41,715	177	73,518	2.03	1.66-2.48	6.89	<.001*
White	147	105,841	200	185,454	1.29	1.04-1.59	2.33	.020*

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Asian children attending schools that have SROs are at .98 times greater risk of being expelled than Asian children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is not statistically significant ( $\chi^2=0.05, p=.963, 95\% CI: 0.40, 2.39$ ). Asian children attending schools without SROs have a similar risk of expulsion as Asian children attending schools without SROs.

Black or African American children attending schools that have SROs are at 1.79 times greater risk of being expelled than Black or African American children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi^2=5.49, p<.001, 95\% CI: 1.45, 2.20$ ).

Hispanic or Latino children attending schools that have SROs are at 2.03 times greater risk of being expelled than Hispanic or Latino children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi^2=6.89, p<.001, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.66, 2.48$ ).

White children attending schools that have SROs are at 1.29 times greater risk of being expelled than White children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi^2=2.33, p=.02, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.04, 1.59$ ).

*Table 5. Black, Hispanic, and White children attending schools with an SRO have a higher risk of being referred to law enforcement (RTL) than Black, Hispanic, and White children attending schools without an SRO.*

Student race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		Relative Risk	95% CI	Z	p-value
	N RTL	N not RTL	N RTL	N not RTL				
Asian	24	9,985	22	14,675	1.60	.90-2.86	1.60	.110
Black or African American	395	20,290	222	40,968	3.54	3.01-4.17	15.16	<.001*
Hispanic or Latino	525	41,394	252	73,443	3.66	3.15-4.25	16.99	<.001*
White	377	105,611	409	185,245	1.61	1.40-1.86	6.72	<.001*

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Asian children attending schools that have SROs are at 1.60 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than Asian children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is not statistically significant ( $\chi^2=1.60, p=.110, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.90, 2.86$ ), and it should be interpreted as no difference due to such small numbers of Asian children experiencing this form of discipline.

Black or African American children attending schools that have SROs are at 3.54 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than Black or African American children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi^2=15.16, p<.001, 95\% \text{ CI: } 3.01, 4.17$ ).

Hispanic or Latino children attending schools that have SROs are at 3.66 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than Hispanic or Latino children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi^2=16.99, p<.001, 95\% \text{ CI: } 3.15, 4.25$ ).

White children attending schools that have SROs are at 1.61 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than White children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi^2=6.72, p<.001, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.40, 1.86$ ).

*Table 6. Black, Hispanic, and White children attending schools with an SRO have a higher risk of being arrested than Black, Hispanic, and White children attending schools without an SRO.*

Student race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		Relative Risk	95% CI	Z	p-value
	N arrested	N not arrested	N arrested	N not arrested				
Asian	14	9,995	10	14,687	2.06	.91-4.63	1.74	.082
Black or African American	295	20,390	160	41,030	3.67	3.03-4.45	13.30	<.001*
Hispanic or Latino	435	41,484	184	73,511	4.16	3.50-4.94	16.24	<.001*
White	301	105,687	188	185,466	2.80	2.34-3.36	11.10	<.001

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Asian children attending schools that have SROs are at 2.06 times greater risk of being arrested in school than Asian children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is not statistically significant ( $\chi=1.74, p=.110, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.91, 4.63$ ), and it should be interpreted as no difference due to such small numbers of Asian children experiencing this form of discipline.

Black children attending schools that have SROs are at 3.67 times greater risk of being arrested in school than Black children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi=13.30, p<.001, 95\% \text{ CI: } 3.03, 4.45$ ).

Latino children attending schools that have SROs are at 4.16 times greater risk of being arrested in school than Latino children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi=16.24, p<.001, 95\% \text{ CI: } 3.50, 4.94$ ).

White children attending schools that have SROs are at 2.80 times greater risk of being arrested in school than White children attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ( $\chi=11.10, p<.001, 95\% \text{ CI: } 2.34, 3.36$ ).

We ran the following analyses to begin to understand the extent to which the increased risk students in schools with SROs face of expulsion, referral to law enforcement, and arrest is explained by the presence of SROs rather than being better explained by other related variables that may impact school disciplinary climate. To understand the impact of the presence of SROs rather than something else, we included total school enrollment count, percent of student populations enrolled in a school, and DRG as covariates in our models. From earlier analyses, we know that larger schools are more likely to have SROs, so we wanted to remove the possibility that differences in discipline simply reflect this effect. We would also imagine that schools with greater populations of students of specific racial and ethnic groups would discipline greater percentages of students from these groups, so in each model we adjusted for the percent of children in a school belonging to the racial/ethnic group being examined. Finally, Connecticut uses DRG designation to group schools according to similar community characteristics and resources. Research suggests that schools with higher levels of poverty often have higher levels of discipline, so including DRG in these analyses is a proxy measure to adjust for community resources.<sup>5</sup>



Our analyses revealed no statistically significant effects of SROs on the average percent of Black, Latino, White and Asian students expelled in schools. Regarding referrals to law enforcement, the only result that was found to be statistically significant once adjusting for school size, student body demographics, and DRG was of the effect of SROs on discipline for Latino students. In schools with SROs, the percentage of Latino students referred to law enforcement was just over six times higher than that of Latino students in schools without SROs. For Black, White, and Asian students, all groups showed higher numbers of referrals when in schools where SROs were present, but this relationship may not be exclusively due to the presence of an SRO but by other factors. Similar effects were found for arrest rates for Black, White and Asian students. Latino students, on the other hand, were over six times more likely to be arrested in school if there is a SRO present.

*Table 7. The average percent of students in various racial/ethnic groups expelled did not significantly differ based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, the percent of students within the specific racial/ethnic group present at the school, and DRG.*

Average percent of students belonging to a racial/ethnic group expelled	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		DF	F	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD			
Asian	.17	.51	.31	4.55	1, 983	.25	.619
Black or African American	.99	6.57	.77	6.50	1, 925	.19	.667
Hispanic or Latino	.64	4.28	.33	4.04	1, 956	.88	.348
White	.17	.67	.31	4.26	1, 983	.25	.619

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

All analyses below of the average percent of students in a particular racial/ethnic group expelled include total school enrollment count, percent of students of the particular racial/ethnic group enrolled in the school, and DRG as covariates.

*Asian.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Asian students expelled in schools,  $F(1,983)=.25, p=.619$ . The average percent of Asian students expelled at schools with SROs ( $M=.17, SD=.51$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Asian students expelled at schools without SROs ( $M=.31, SD=4.55$ ).

*Black or African American.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Black or African American students expelled in schools,  $F(1,925)=.19, p=.667$ . The average percent of Black or African American students expelled at schools with SROs ( $M=.99, SD=6.57$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Black or African American students expelled at schools without SROs ( $M=.77, SD=6.50$ ).

*Hispanic or Latino.* An univariate ANOVA found no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students expelled in schools,  $F(1,956)=.88, p=.348$ . The average percent of Hispanic or Latino students expelled at schools with SROs ( $M=.64, SD=4.28$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students expelled at schools without SROs ( $M=.33, SD=4.04$ ).

*White.* An univariate ANOVA discovered no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of White students expelled in schools,  $F(1,983)=.247, p=.62$ . The average percent of White students expelled at schools with SROs ( $M=.17, SD=.67$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of White students expelled at schools without SROs ( $M=.31, SD=4.26$ ).

*Table 8. The average percent of Hispanic or Latino students referred to law enforcement differed significantly based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, the percent of students within the specific racial/ethnic group present at the school, and DRG.*

Average percent of students belonging to a racial/ethnic group referred to law enforcement	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		DF	F	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD			
Asian	.43	4.35	.23	2.67	1, 876	.59	.441
Black or African American	1.48	6.73	1.20	6.87	1, 925	.26	.608
Hispanic or Latino	2.32	7.88	.37	4.97	1, 958	18.04	<.001*
White	1.12	8.02	.50	5.79	1, 983	1.96	.162

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

All analyses, below, of the average percent of students in a particular racial/ethnic group referred to law enforcement include total school enrollment count, percent of students of the particular racial/ethnic group enrolled in the school, and DRG as covariates.

*Asian.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Asian students referred to law enforcement,  $F(1,876)=.59, p=.441$ . The average percent of Asian students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs ( $M=.43, SD=4.35$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Asian students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs ( $M=.23, SD=2.67$ ).

*Black or African American.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement,  $F(1,925)=.26, p=.608$ . The average percent of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs ( $M=1.48, SD=6.73$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs ( $M=1.20, SD=6.87$ ).

*Hispanic or Latino.* An univariate ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students referred to law enforcement,  $F(1,958)=18.04, p<.001$ . This means that the presence of SROs in schools impacted the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students in schools being referred to law enforcement over and above any impact due school size, schools having greater representation of Hispanic or Latino students within, or schools being located in areas with fewer resources. The average percent of Hispanic or Latino students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs ( $M=2.32, SD=7.88$ ) was significantly larger than

the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs ( $M=.37, SD=4.97$ ).

*White.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of White students referred to law enforcement,  $F(1,983)=1.96, p=.162$ . The average percent of White students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs ( $M=1.12, SD=8.02$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of White students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs ( $M=.50, SD=5.79$ ).

*Table 9. The average percent of Hispanic or Latino students arrested differed significantly based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, the percent of students within the specific racial/ethnic group present at the school, and DRG.*

Average percent of students belonging to a racial/ethnic group arrested	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		DF	F	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD			
Asian	.54	.41	.16	2.46	1, 876	.96	.328
Black or African American	1.06	3.83	.72	5.21	1, 925	.82	.367
Hispanic or Latino	1.57	7.04	.26	3.21	1, 958	13.48	<.001*
White	.54	2.99	.20	2.68	1, 983	2.55	.111

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

All analyses, below, of the average percent of students in a particular racial/ethnic group arrested include total school enrollment count, percent of students of the particular racial/ethnic group enrolled in the school, and DRG as covariates.

*Asian.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Asian students arrested in school,  $F(1,876)=.96, p=.328$ . The average percent of Asian students arrested in school at schools with SROs ( $M=.54, SD=.41$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Asian students arrested in school at schools without SROs ( $M=.16, SD=2.46$ ).

*Black or African American.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Black or African American students arrested in school,  $F(1,925)=.82, p=.367$ . The average percent of Black or African American students arrested in school at schools with SROs ( $M=1.06, SD=3.83$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Black or African American students arrested in school at schools without SROs ( $M=.72, SD=5.21$ ).

*Hispanic or Latino.* An univariate ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students arrested in school,  $F(1,958)=13.48, p<.001$ . This means that the presence of SROs in schools impacted the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students in schools being arrested over and above any impact due school size, schools having greater representation of Latino students within, or schools being located in areas with fewer resources. The average percent of Hispanic or Latino students arrested in school at schools with SROs ( $M=1.57,$

$SD=7.04$ ) was significantly larger than the average percent of Hispanic or Latino students arrested in school at schools without SROs ( $M=.26, SD=3.21$ ).

*White.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of White students arrested in school,  $F(1,983)=2.55, p=.111$ . The average percent of White students arrested in school at schools with SROs ( $M=.54, SD=2.99$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of White students arrested in school at schools without SROs ( $M=.20, SD=2.68$ ).

The risk ratios showed that when not controlling for other variables that may impact school disciplinary climate, most student groups faced greater risk of expulsion, referral to law enforcement, and arrest if they attended a school with a SRO present than if they attended a school without a SRO present. When controlling for a few variables that could impact school discipline, we still find that the presence of SROs contributes significant variance to the percentage of Latino students referred to law enforcement and arrested. We will speculate upon this finding later in the report, but for now we provide evidence showing that some Connecticut students face increased discipline when they attend schools with school resource officers present, and the difference in discipline is not better explained by some other variable impacting school climate. While our data does not allow us to make causal conclusions, it suggests that school resource officers may uniquely contribute to disparities in school discipline for Connecticut’s Latino students.

### *Student Achievement and School Climate*

There was no statistically significant effect of the presence of a SRO on the percentage of White or all students who scored at or above the benchmark on the Smarter Balance ELA and Math exams. The percentage of students who scored at or above each benchmark was slightly—but not significantly-- higher in schools without a SRO present. This suggests that school resource officers do not have a significant positive or negative impact on students’ ability to learn, as is hypothesized in literature promoting or preventing the use of school resource officers.<sup>6</sup>

*Table 10. The average percent of students scoring at or above proficient on Smarter Balance test scores did not based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, the percent of White students present at the school, and DRG.*

		Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		DF	F	p-value
		M	SD	M	SD			
Average percent of students scoring at or above “proficient” on Smarter Balance test								
White	ELA	52.96	28.45	55.17	25.73	1, 671	.63	.427
	Math	42.91	25.46	45.63	26.83	1, 672	1.06	.303
All	ELA	47.68	24.29	51.55	25.55	1, 689	2.45	.118
	Math	39.94	23.21	43.34	24.65	1, 696	2.10	.148

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection, 2015-2015 Smarter Balanced Test Scores as Reported on Edsight.ct.gov

All analyses, below, of the average Smarter Balanced Test Score include total school enrollment count, percent of White students enrolled in the school, and DRG as covariates.

*Percent of White students scoring proficient or above on Smarter Balance English Language Arts test.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of White students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test,  $F(1,671)=.63, p=.427$ . The average percent of White students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test in schools with SROs ( $M=52.96, SD=28.45$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of White students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test in schools without SROs ( $M=55.17, SD=25.73$ ).

*Percent of White students scoring proficient or above on Smarter Balance Mathematics test.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of White students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance Math test,  $F(1,672)=1.06, p=.303$ . The average percent of White students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance Math test in schools with SROs ( $M=42.91, SD=25.46$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of White students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance Math test in schools without SROs ( $M=45.63, SD=26.83$ ).

*Percent of all students scoring proficient or above on Smarter Balance English Language Arts test.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test,  $F(1,689)=2.45, p=.118$ . The average percent of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test in schools with SROs ( $M=47.68, SD=24.29$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test in schools without SROs ( $M=51.55, SD=25.55$ ).

*Percent of all students scoring proficient or above on Smarter Balance English Language Arts test.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test,  $F(1,696)=2.10, p=.148$ . The average percent of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test in schools with SROs ( $M=39.94, SD=23.21$ ) did not significantly differ from the average percent of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balance ELA test in schools without SROs ( $M=43.34, SD=24.65$ ).

Of note is that Smarter Balance ELA and Math scores are lower for in schools with SROs present, though not significantly, and they are lower for “all students” than for White students. This suggests that within groups of children of color, the presence of SROs may still have an impact on academic achievement in a way that this data set does not allow us to measure. There are too many missing and suppressed data to draw solid conclusions, but this is an area that deserves additional research by state agencies.

The only two categories of school incidents in which the presence of a SRO has a significant effect are in the counts of school policy violations and fighting/battery incidences. In both instances, the presence of an SRO is related to increases in the average number of school policy violations and in the average number of fights. Further investigation shows that there are two outliers<sup>7</sup> in the number of fights reported by schools with SROs that have an impact on these finding. When these two outliers are removed, schools no longer significantly differ in the average number of fights broken up by the presence of an SRO,  $F(1,726)=1.63, p=.202$ . Schools with SROs ( $M=13.88, SD=22.95$ ) had an average number of fighting and battery incidents statistically similar to the average number of fighting and battery incidents in schools without SROs ( $M=11.29, SD=21.11$ ). Similarly, in schools

with SROs, school policy violations are significantly higher than in schools without SROs. Although there are schools with outliers that pull up the average number of school policy violations, there are an equal number of outlier schools among schools with SROs present and schools without SROs present. When we removed all schools that reported more than 1,000 school policy violations in the 2015-2016 SY<sup>8</sup>, the difference in school policy violations based upon the presence of an SRO was still significant,  $F(1, 723)=5.28, p=.022$ . Schools with SROs ( $M=55.41, SD=127.95$ ) had a significantly greater average number of incidents of school policy violations than schools without SROs ( $M=36.10, SD=71.95$ ). Therefore, we conclude that the difference in the count of school policy violations reported in schools with SROs present is not due to a few outlier schools. Rather, the increased reporting of school policy violations among schools with SROs may be due to these schools imposing more disciplinary actions on students. It is possible that when a SRO is present to address very serious behaviors, school administrators have more time to report minor behaviors. It is also possible that SROs present mean that there are more eyes watching for behaviors to report. Finally, it is possible that schools with SROs have a more punitive school climate that leads to normal adolescent behaviors being punished. Our data cannot speak to which of these may explain the difference in reporting of school policy violations between schools with SROs and schools without SROs. The presence of an SRO does not appear to have a significant effect on the counts of violent, sexual, property damage, drug, personal threat, theft, confrontation and, weapons incidences.

*Table 11. The average count school policy violations differed significantly based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, the percent of White students present at the school, and DRG.*

Average incident counts	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		DF	F	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD			
Violence	.65	1.63	.65	1.54	1, 728	.00	.981
Sex Related	1.52	2.65	1.34	2.68	1, 728	.52	.471
Property Damage	1.38	3.37	1.42	2.65	1, 728	.03	.873
Drugs and Alcohol	2.49	5.69	2.77	6.71	1, 728	.22	.638
School Policy Violations	86.24	276.10	43.52	139.75	1, 728	6.12	.014*
Personal Threats	7.76	12.18	6.07	8.45	1, 728	3.44	.064
Theft	2.11	3.30	1.88	3.08	1, 728	.59	.444
Confrontation	14.74	26.78	12.00	26.31	1, 728	1.12	.290
Fighting and Battery	18.34	43.39	11.06	20.52	1, 728	7.38	.007*
Weapons	1.63	2.10	1.31	2.12	1, 728	2.44	.119

Source: 2015-2016 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection, 2015-2015 incident counts as reported on Edsight.ct.gov

All analyses, below, of the average count of incidents in schools based upon the presence of SROs, included the total enrollment of schools, the percent of White students enrolled in the school, and DRG as covariates.

*Violence.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of incidents of violence reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=0.00, p=.981$ . The average count of incidents of violence in schools with SROs ( $M=.65, SD=1.63$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of incidents of violence in schools without SROs ( $M=.65, SD=1.54$ ).

*Sex Related.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of sex related incidents reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=.52, p=.471$ . The average count of sex related incidents in schools with SROs ( $M=1.52, SD=2.65$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of sex related incidents in schools without SROs ( $M=1.43, SD=2.68$ ).

*Property Damage.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of incidents of property damage reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=.03, p=.873$ . The average count of incidents of property damage in schools with SROs ( $M=1.38, SD=3.37$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of incidents of property damage in schools without SROs ( $M=1.42, SD=2.65$ ).

*Drugs and Alcohol.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of incidents of drugs and alcohol reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=.22, p=.638$ . The average count of incidents of drugs and alcohol in schools with SROs ( $M=2.49, SD=5.69$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of incidents of drugs and alcohol in schools without SROs ( $M=2.77, SD=6.71$ ).

*School Policy Violations.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of school policy violations reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=6.12, p=.014$ . The average count of school policy violations in schools with SROs ( $M=86.24, SD=276.10$ ) was significantly larger than the average count of school policy violations in schools without SROs ( $M=43.52, SD=139.75$ ), and this remained true even after removing outlier schools that reported more than 1000 school policy violations in the 2015-2016 SY.

*Personal Threats.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of personal threats reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=3.44, p=.064$ . The average count of personal threats in schools with SROs ( $M=7.76, SD=12.18$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of personal threats in schools without SROs ( $M=6.07, SD=8.45$ ).

*Theft.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of incidents of theft reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=.59, p=.444$ . The average count of incidents of theft in schools with SROs ( $M=2.11, SD=3.30$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of incidents of theft in schools without SROs ( $M=1.88, SD=3.08$ ).

*Confrontation.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of incidents of confrontation reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=1.12, p=.290$ . The average count of incidents of confrontation in schools with SROs ( $M=14.74, SD=26.78$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of incidents of confrontation in schools without SROs ( $M=12.00, SD=26.31$ ).

*Fighting and Battery.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of incidents of fighting and battery reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=7.38, p=.007$ . The

average count of incidents of fighting and battery in schools with SROs ( $M=18.34$ ,  $SD=43.39$ ) was significantly larger than the average count of incidents of fighting and battery in schools without SROs ( $M=11.06$ ,  $SD=20.52$ ). After removing two outliers that reported more than 201 incidents of fighting and battery in SY 2015-2016, however, the difference was no longer statistically significant.

*Weapons.* An univariate ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of weapons incidents reported by schools,  $F(1,728)=2.44$ ,  $p=.119$ . The average count of weapons incidents in schools with SROs ( $M=1.63$ ,  $SD=2.10$ ) did not significantly differ from the average count of weapons incidents in schools without SROs ( $M=1.31$ ,  $SD=2.12$ ).



## *Appendix B*

### *Schools Reporting the Presence of SROs in the 2015-2016 School Year to the US Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection*

District	DRG	School
Ansonia School District	H	Ansonia High School
Ansonia School District	H	P.A.C.E. (Positive And Creative Education)
Ansonia School District	H	P.A.C.E. - PM (Positive And Creative Education - PM)
Berlin School District	D	Berlin High School
Berlin School District	D	Catherine M. McGee Middle School
Bethany School District	C	Bethany Community School
Bethel School District	D	Anna H. Rockwell School
Bethel School District	D	Bethel High School
Bethel School District	D	Bethel Middle School
Bethel School District	D	Frank A. Berry School
Bethel School District	D	Ralph M. T. Johnson School
Bloomfield School District	G	Bloomfield High School
Bloomfield School District	G	Carmen Arace Intermediate School
Bloomfield School District	G	Carmen Arace Middle School
Bristol School District	G	Bristol Central High School
Bristol School District	G	Bristol Eastern High School
Bristol School District	G	Chippens Hill Middle School
Bristol School District	G	Greene-Hills School
Bristol School District	G	Northeast Middle School
Bristol School District	G	West Bristol School
Brookfield School District	B	Brookfield High School
Brookfield School District	B	Center Elementary School
Brookfield School District	B	Huckleberry Hill Elementary School
Brookfield School District	B	Whisconier Middle School
Capitol Region Education Council		Soundbridge @ Bristol Central HS
Capitol Region Education Council		Soundbridge @ Chippens Hill MS Bristol
Cheshire School District	B	Cheshire High School
Clinton School District	D	The Morgan School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System		A. I. Prince Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System		Bullard-Havens Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System		E. C. Goodwin Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System		Eli Whitney Technical High School

Connecticut Technical Education and Career System		H. C. Wilcox Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System		Howell Cheney Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System		Platt Technical High School
Cromwell School District	D	Cromwell High School
Cromwell School District	D	Cromwell Middle School
Cromwell School District	D	Edna C. Stevens School
Cromwell School District	D	Woodside Intermediate School
Danbury School District	H	Broadview Middle School
Danbury School District	H	Danbury High School
Danbury School District	H	Rogers Park Middle School
Darien School District	A	Darien High School
East Hartford School District	H	East Hartford High School
East Hartford School District	H	East Hartford Middle School
East Windsor School District	F	Broad Brook Elementary School
East Windsor School District	F	East Windsor High School
East Windsor School District	F	East Windsor Middle School
Ellington School District	C	Ellington High School
Fairfield School District	B	Fairfield Ludlowe High School
Fairfield School District	B	Fairfield Warde High School
Farmington School District	B	East Farms School
Farmington School District	B	Farmington Alternative High School
Farmington School District	B	Farmington High School
Farmington School District	B	Irving A. Robbins Middle School
Farmington School District	B	Noah Wallace School
Farmington School District	B	Union School
Farmington School District	B	West District School
Farmington School District	B	West Woods Upper Elementary School
Glastonbury School District	B	Glastonbury High School
Glastonbury School District	B	Smith Middle School
Greenwich School District	B	Greenwich High School
Groton School District	G	Robert E. Fitch High School
Guilford School District	B	A. Baldwin Middle School
Guilford School District	B	Guilford High School
Hamden School District	G	Hamden High School
Hamden School District	G	Hamden Middle School
Learn		Marine Science Magnet High School of Southeastern Connecticut
Manchester School District	G	Bentley Alternative Education Program
Manchester School District	G	Bowers School
Manchester School District	G	Buckley School
Manchester School District	G	Elisabeth M. Bennet Academy
Manchester School District	G	Highland Park School

Manchester School District	G	Illing Middle School
Manchester School District	G	Keeney School
Manchester School District	G	Manchester High School
Manchester School District	G	Manchester Preschool Center
Manchester School District	G	Manchester Regional Academy
Manchester School District	G	Martin School
Manchester School District	G	New Horizons
Manchester School District	G	Robertson School
Manchester School District	G	Verplanck School
Manchester School District	G	Waddell School
Manchester School District	G	Washington School
Meriden School District	H	Benjamin Franklin School
Meriden School District	H	Casimir Pulaski School
Meriden School District	H	Francis T. Maloney High School
Meriden School District	H	Hanover School
Meriden School District	H	Israel Putnam School
Meriden School District	H	John Barry School
Meriden School District	H	Lincoln Middle School
Meriden School District	H	Nathan Hale School
Meriden School District	H	Orville H. Platt High School
Meriden School District	H	Roger Sherman School
Meriden School District	H	Thomas Hooker School
Meriden School District	H	Washington Middle School
Middletown School District	G	Middletown High School
Milford School District	D	East Shore Middle School
Milford School District	D	Jonathan Law High School
Milford School District	D	Joseph A. Foran High School
Monroe School District	B	Fawn Hollow Elementary School
Monroe School District	B	Jockey Hollow School
Monroe School District	B	Masuk High School
Monroe School District	B	Monroe Elementary School
Monroe School District	B	Stepney Elementary School
Naugatuck School District	G	Naugatuck High School
New Britain School District	I	New Britain High School
New Canaan School District	A	New Canaan High School
New Fairfield School District	B	Alternative Learning Center
New Fairfield School District	B	Consolidated School
New Fairfield School District	B	New Fairfield High School
New Fairfield School District	B	New Fairfield Middle School
New Haven School District	I	Celentano BioTech, Health and Medical Magnet School
New Haven School District	I	Clinton Avenue School
New Haven School District	I	Columbus Family Academy
New Haven School District	I	Conte/West Hills Magnet School

New Haven School District	I	East Rock Community Magnet School
New Haven School District	I	Edgewood School
New Haven School District	I	Engineering - Science University Magnet School
New Haven School District	I	Fair Haven School
New Haven School District	I	Hill Central Music Academy
New Haven School District	I	Hill Regional Career High School
New Haven School District	I	James Hillhouse High School
New Haven School District	I	Lincoln-Bassett School
New Haven School District	I	New Horizons High School
New Haven School District	I	New Light High School
New Haven School District	I	Quinnipiac Real World Math STEM School
New Haven School District	I	Riverside Education Academy
New Haven School District	I	Sound School
New Haven School District	I	Strong 21st Century Communications Magnet and SCSU Lab School
New Haven School District	I	Wilbur Cross High School
New London School District	I	New London High School
New Milford School District	D	Hill And Plain School
New Milford School District	D	New Milford High School
New Milford School District	D	Northville Elementary School
New Milford School District	D	Sarah Noble Intermediate School
New Milford School District	D	Schaghticoke Middle School
Newington School District	D	Newington High School
Newtown School District	B	Hawley Elementary School
Newtown School District	B	Head O'Meadow Elementary School
Newtown School District	B	Middle Gate Elementary School
Newtown School District	B	Newtown High School
Newtown School District	B	Newtown Middle School
Newtown School District	B	Reed Intermediate School
Newtown School District	B	Sandy Hook Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Brien McMahon High School
Norwalk School District	H	Brookside Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Columbus Magnet School
Norwalk School District	H	Cranbury Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Fox Run Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Jefferson Magnet School
Norwalk School District	H	Kendall Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Marvin Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Naramake Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Nathan Hale Middle School
Norwalk School District	H	Norwalk High School
Norwalk School District	H	Norwalk Pathways Academy at Briggs
Norwalk School District	H	Ponus Ridge Middle School

Norwalk School District	H	Roton Middle School
Norwalk School District	H	Rowayton School
Norwalk School District	H	Silvermine Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Tracey School
Norwalk School District	H	West Rocks Middle School
Norwalk School District	H	Wolfpit School
Norwich School District	H	ABA Program @ Kelly
Norwich School District	H	Kelly STEAM Magnet Middle School
Old Saybrook School District	D	Kathleen E. Goodwin School
Old Saybrook School District	D	Old Saybrook Middle School
Old Saybrook School District	D	Old Saybrook Senior High School
Orange School District	B	Mary L. Tracy School
Orange School District	B	Peck Place School
Orange School District	B	Race Brook School
Orange School District	B	Turkey Hill School
Plymouth School District	F	Terryville High School
Redding School District	A	John Read Middle School
Redding School District	A	Redding Elementary School
Regional School District 05	B	Amity Regional High School
Regional School District 07	C	Northwestern Regional Middle School
Regional School District 10	C	Har-Bur Middle School
Regional School District 10	C	Lewis S. Mills High School
Regional School District 11	F	Northwestern Regional High School
Regional School District 11	F	Harwinton Consolidated School
Regional School District 12	C	Lake Garda Elementary School
Regional School District 12	C	Booth Free School
Regional School District 12	C	The Burnham School
Regional School District 12	C	Washington Primary School
Regional School District 13	C	Shepaug Valley School
Regional School District 14	C	Bethlehem Elementary School
Regional School District 15	B	Mitchell Elementary School
Regional School District 15	B	Pomperaug Regional High School
Regional School District 16	E	Nonnewaug High School
Regional School District 18	C	Woodbury Middle School
Ridgefield School District	A	East Ridge Middle School
Ridgefield School District	A	Farmingville Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	Ridgebury Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	Ridgefield High School
Ridgefield School District	A	Scotland Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	Scotts Ridge Middle School
Ridgefield School District	A	Veterans Park Elementary School
Rocky Hill School District	D	Albert D. Griswold Middle School
Rocky Hill School District	D	Myrtle H. Stevens School
Rocky Hill School District	D	Rocky Hill High School

Rocky Hill School District	D	West Hill School
Scotland School District	E	Scotland Elementary School
Shelton School District	D	Intermediate School
Shelton School District	D	Shelton High School
Side By Side Charter School District		Side By Side Charter School
Simsbury School District	B	Central School
Simsbury School District	B	Henry James Memorial School
Simsbury School District	B	Latimer Lane School
Simsbury School District	B	Simsbury High School
Simsbury School District	B	Squadron Line School
Simsbury School District	B	Tariffville School
Simsbury School District	B	Tootin' Hills School
Somers School District	C	Aspire
Somers School District	C	Mabelle B. Avery Middle School
Somers School District	C	Somers Elementary School
Somers School District	C	Somers High School
South Windsor School District	B	South Windsor High School
South Windsor School District	B	Timothy Edwards School
Stamford School District	H	Rippowam Middle School
Stamford School District	H	Stamford High School
Stamford School District	H	The Academy of Information Technology
Stamford School District	H	Westhill High School
Suffield School District	C	A. Ward Spaulding School
Suffield School District	C	McAlister Intermediate School
Suffield School District	C	Suffield High School
Suffield School District	C	Suffield Middle School
Tolland School District	C	Birch Grove Primary School
Tolland School District	C	Tolland High School
Tolland School District	C	Tolland Intermediate School
Tolland School District	C	Tolland Middle School
Torrington School District	G	Torrington High School
Vernon School District	G	Rockville High School
Waterbury School District	I	Crosby Autism
Waterbury School District	I	Crosby High School
Waterbury School District	I	Enlightenment School
Waterbury School District	I	John F. Kennedy High School
Waterbury School District	I	Michael F. Wallace Autism
Waterbury School District	I	Michael F. Wallace Middle School
Waterbury School District	I	North End BDLC
Waterbury School District	I	North End Bilingual
Waterbury School District	I	North End ESC
Waterbury School District	I	North End Middle School
Waterbury School District	I	State Street School
Waterbury School District	I	Wallace BDLC

Waterbury School District	I	Wallace Bilingual
Waterbury School District	I	Wallace SCOPE
Waterbury School District	I	West Side BDLC
Waterbury School District	I	West Side Bilingual
Waterbury School District	I	West Side Middle School
Waterbury School District	I	West Side SCOPE
Waterbury School District	I	Wilby ESC
Waterbury School District	I	Wilby High School
Waterford School District	D	Clark Lane Middle School
Waterford School District	D	Waterford High School
Watertown School District	D	Swift Middle School
Watertown School District	D	Watertown High School
West Hartford School District	B	Conard High School
West Hartford School District	B	Hall High School
West Hartford School District	B	King Philip Middle School
West Hartford School District	B	Sedgwick Middle School
West Haven School District	H	Carrigan 5/6 Intermediate School
West Haven School District	H	Harry M. Bailey Middle School
West Haven School District	H	West Haven High School
Wethersfield School District	D	Silas Deane Middle School
Wethersfield School District	D	Wethersfield High School
Wilton School District	A	Cider Mill School
Wilton School District	A	Wilton High School
Windham School District	I	Windham High School
Windham School District	I	Windham Middle School
Windsor Locks School District	F	Windsor Locks High School
Windsor School District	D	Windsor High School
Wolcott School District	F	Wolcott High School
Woodbridge School District	B	Beecher Road School

<sup>1</sup> Connecticut State Department of Education. (2018). *Home*. Retrieved from Edsight-Insight into Education: <http://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do>

<sup>2</sup> Connecticut Department of Education. (2015). Appendix A. *District Reference Groups (DRG)*.

<sup>3</sup> Connecticut State Department of Education. (2015, August). *Data Suppression Guidelines*. Retrieved from Edsight-Insight into Education: <http://edsight.ct.gov/relatedreports/BDCRE%20Data%20Suppression%20Rules.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Medcalc Software. (2019). *Relative Risk Calculator*. Retrieved from MedCalc - Easy to Use Statistical Software: [https://www.medcalc.org/calc/relative\\_risk.php](https://www.medcalc.org/calc/relative_risk.php)

<sup>5</sup> McLoughlin, C. & Noltemeyer, A. (2010). Research into Factors Contributing to Discipline Use and Disproportionality in Major Urban Schools. *Current Issues in Education*, 13(2). <http://cie.asu.edu/>

<sup>6</sup> Rosiak, J. (2017). 5 Things to Consider Before Posting Cops in Schools. *Education Week*, 37(8), 16-19. Retrieved from: <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2017/10/11/5-things-to-consider-before-posting-cops.html>

---

<sup>7</sup> Read School in Bridgeport, which reported 221 incidents of fighting and battery, and Roosevelt School in Bridgeport, which reported 259 incidents of fighting and battery in SY 2015-2016.

<sup>8</sup> Schools with SROs that reported more than 1000 school policy violations in SY 2015-2016 include: Central High School in Bridgeport, which reported 1063 violations, Crosby High School in Waterbury, which reported 1831 violations, John F. Kennedy High School in Waterbury, which reported 1831 violations, and Wilby High School in Waterbury, which reported 2276 violations. Schools without SROs that reported more than 1000 school policy violations in SY 2015-2016 include: East Hartford High School, which reported 1420 violations, Danbury High School, which reported 1321 violations, and New Britain High School, which reported 2419 violations.